

IN THE CLAIMS

1. (Twice Amended) A sensor cartridge for a fluid analyte analyzer, including
 - a. a sensor assembly, including:
 - i. a substrate;
 - ii. a plurality of sensors deposited on a first side of the substrate;
 - iii. a plurality of electrical conductors deposited on a second side of the substrate;
 - iv. a plurality of subminiature thru-holes having a diameter in the range of about 0.002-.006 inches filled with electrically conductive material, each thru-hole disposed directly under a corresponding one of the sensors for coupling one of the sensors with one of the electrical conductors;
 - v. an electrical connector disposed on the second side of the substrate, the connector having a plurality of electrical contacts, at least some of the electrical contacts corresponding one to one with an associated one of the electrical conductors and at least some of the electrical contacts being coupled to the associated one of the electrical conductors; and
 - b. an encasement into which the sensor assembly is placed for directing the flow of the analyte over the sensors, and preventing contact of the analyte with the second side of the substrate, including:
 - i. an inlet for allowing the fluid analyte to enter the encasement;
 - ii. an outlet for allowing the fluid analyte to exit the encasement;
 - iii. a flow channel between the inlet and the outlet for allowing the fluid

analyte to pass through the housing and over each of the sensors; and

iv. an opening at one side for exposing the electrical connector.

6. (Twice Amended) The sensor cartridge of claim 3, further including a third cell, the third cell and the reference cell disposed symmetrically about the flow channel [with respect to the reference cell].

9. (Twice Amended) The sensor cartridge of claim 1, wherein the encasement is formed of a composition of acrylic, styrene, and [butadine] butadiene.

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 remain herein for consideration. Reconsideration in view of this amendment is requested.

By this amendment, Claims 1, 6 and 9 have been amended.

Rejections Under §112, second paragraph

The Examiner has rejected Claim 1 under 35 USC §112, second paragraph stating that the term "subminiature" is "vague". This rejection is traversed because the subminiature through holes are clearly defined as in a range of approximately 0.002- .006 inches at page 6, lines 5-7, page 15, lines 13-15. The advantages of these subminiature holes are also pointed out at page 6, lines 7-14, and at page 15, line 15-17. Further advantages of the miniature and subminiature construction is discussed at page 11, line 11 through page 12, line 9. Claim 1 has been amended